



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,746	03/24/2004	Lauren O. Bakaletz	28335/39196A	6532
4743	7590	11/02/2006	EXAMINER	
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606			GRASER, JENNIFER E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/807,746

Applicant(s)

BAKALETZ ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer E. Graser

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

There is no claim number 3. Misnumbered claims 4-19 should be renumbered as claims 3-18. The Restriction below has been done on the claim numbers as originally filed.***Election/Restrictions***

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1 and 2, drawn to an isolated polynucleotide, classified in class 536, subclass 23.7. **NOTE:** Applicants must elect a single polynucleotide by sequence identifier for Examination, e.g, SEQ ID NO:1. This is a Restriction Requirement, not a Species Election.
- II. Claims 4 and 5, drawn to an isolated polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350. **NOTE:** Applicants must elect a single polypeptide by sequence identifier for Examination, e.g, SEQ ID NO: 2. This is a Restriction Requirement, not a Species Election.
- III. Claims 7 and 8, drawn to an isolated antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1. **NOTE:** Applicants must elect a single antibody by the polypeptide it specifically binds, e.g, an isolated antibody that specifically

binds to the polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 7. This is a Restriction Requirement, not a Species Election.

- IV. Claims 9, 10 and 12, drawn to a method for detecting NTHi bacteria in a sample in a hybridization assay, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- V. Claim 11 and 12, drawn to a method for detecting NTHi bacteria in a sample comprising contacting an antibody with a sample and detecting its binding, classified in class 435, subclass 7.4.
- VI. Claim 13, drawn to a method for eliciting an immune response to NTHi bacteria comprising administering a polypeptide, classified in class 424, subclass 234.1.
- VII. Claims 14-18, drawn to a method of treating or preventing NTHi bacterial infection through the administration of an antibody, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.
- VIII. Claim 19, drawn to a method of modulating virulence of a NTHi bacterium comprising mutating genes with the *sap* operon wherein the mutation increases sensitivity to antimicrobial agents, classified in class 434, subclass 172.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The claims contained with Group I (Group II and Group III) read on patentably distinct sequences. Each sequence is patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences. For amino acid/polypeptide or nucleotide sequences, the Applicants must elect a single sequence (See MPEP 803.04). It is noted that the multitude of sequence

submissions of examination has resulted in an undue search burden if more than one sequence is elected. MPEP 803.04 states: Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions with the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. Examination will be restricted to only the elected sequence. It is additionally noted that this sequence election requirement is a restriction requirement and not a species election requirement.

Inventions I-III are patentably distinct products.

The polypeptide of group II and polynucleotide of group I are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In addition, while a polypeptide of group II can be made by methods using the polynucleotides that fall within the scope of group I, it can also be recovered from a natural source using biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and II are patentably distinct. Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups I and II

Art Unit: 1645

together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers which had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of groups I and II together.

The polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons:

While the inventions of both group II and group III are polypeptides, in this instance the polypeptide of group II is a single chain molecule that functions as an enzyme, whereas the polypeptide of group III encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide of group II and an antibody of group III is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptides that the antibody binds and the scope

Art Unit: 1645

of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with the polypeptide. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group II and group III would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and an antibody which binds to the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid sequence search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of group III. Furthermore, antibodies which bind to an epitope of a polypeptide of group II may be known even if a polypeptide of group II is novel. In addition, the technical literature search for the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are not coextensive, e.g., antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of or sequence of their binding target.

The polynucleotide of group I and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons. The antibody of group III includes, for example, IgG molecules which comprise 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs). Polypeptides, such as the antibody of group II which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of nucleic acids, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group I

will not encode an antibody of group III, and the antibody of group III cannot be encoded by a polynucleotide of group I. Therefore the antibody and polynucleotide are patentably distinct. The antibody and polynucleotide inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group I and group III would impose a serious search burden since a search of the polynucleotide of group I is would not be used to determine the patentability of an antibody of group III, and vice-versa.

Inventions IV-IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. The method of detecting NTHi bacteria using an antibody (group VI), the method of detecting NTHi bacteria using a polynucleotide (group IV), the method of detecting NTHi bacteria using a polypeptide (group V), the method of eliciting an immune response to NTHi bacteria using a polypeptide (group VII), a method of modulating virulence of a NTHi bacterium comprising mutating genes with the *sap* operon wherein the mutation increases sensitivity to antimicrobial agents and the method of treating or preventing NTHi using an antibody (group IX) are all unrelated as they comprise distinct steps and utilize different products which demonstrates that each method has a different mode of operation. Each invention performs this function using a structurally and functionally divergent material. Moreover, the methodology and materials necessary for detection of the bacterium differ significantly for each of the materials. For diagnosis using the

polynucleotide, hybridization may be used. For diagnosis using the antibody, quantitation of labeled antibody may be used. For treatment of an NTHi infection using the polypeptide, the polypeptide is administered to a patient. Therefore, each method is divergent in materials and steps. For these reasons the Inventions IV-IX are patentably distinct.

Inventions I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the polynucleotide can be used in methods other than detection, e.g., they may be used in methods of recombinant protein production.

Inventions II and V/VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the polypeptide can be used for a method of immunization or a method of detection.

Inventions III and VI/VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different

process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the antibody can be used for a method of immunization or a method of detection.

- a. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double

Art Unit: 1645

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.


Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and their recognized divergent subject matter and because the literature search required for the Groups is not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. Correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1645. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Remsen. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1645 Fax number is 571-273-8300 which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer E. Graser whose telephone number is (571) 272-0858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (571) 272-0974.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0500.

  
Jennifer Graser  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1645

10/27/00